CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
TRANSFERRED TO

The Protestant Review

Volume XXXIII, Number II
November, 1916

Nathan and the Pope.

THE ADDRESS OF SIGNOR NATHAN,

ex-Mayor of Rome, which has enraged the pope and has excited American Romanists to Boycott the Panama Exposition.

THE POPE'S UNPRECEDENTED REPLY.

SIGNOR NATHAN'S REJOINDER.

32 PAGES. PRICE TEN CENTS A COPY.

Why must We Fight the Roman Church?

By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.

Five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred.

"An admirable address."—The Guardian of Liberty.

The President and the "Pan-American" Political Thanksgiving Mass,

By the Rev. Prof. W. Russell Collins, D.D.

Five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred.

"A powerful pamphlet."—The Guardian of Liberty.

"Ought to be written in golden letters and posted on every door of the whole White House; . . . ought to be sent to every senator, congressman, preacher and editor in this land."—P. A. Seguin, ex-priest and author.

"The best thing I have seen in a long time, and I read most all of the patriotic papers."—V. L. W.

The Protestant Review

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Published by

CHRIST'S MISSION

EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.

Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.

MANUEL FERRANDO, Director and Editor.

331 West 57th Street, NEW YORK.

VOL. XXXIII. NOVEMBER, 1916. No. 11.

CONTENTS

	Page
God Knows. (Poem.)	322
Editorial Notes:	
Blind Leaders	323
An American Catholic Quandary	327
Catholicism Contra Mundum. From "The New Republic."	328
Have We an Objective? What is it? From "The American Citizen."	331
A New Dogma. By the Editor	336
Adoration. A Dialogue. From "The Chronicle Press."	341
Sequestration of the Person. By Catherine Walters	344
Beware of Popery in Politics! By Rev. James L. Gordon, D. D.	347
The World's Empty Continent. By James M. Taylor	348
The New York Herald and The Roman Hierarchy. By Rev. W. Russell Collins, D. D., in "David's Sling."	350
"As Thy Days So Shall Thy Strength Be." (Poem.)	351
Of Divine Wisdom. Molinos, 1675	352

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

Subscription per year	**$1.50**	**To Ministers and Missionaries**	**$1.00**
Single copy	15	Twenty or more copies, each	10
Ten copies to one address, per year, each	1.25	Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each	1.00

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Protestant Review, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date of the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

GOD KNOWS

"Thou knewest my path." *Ps.* 142 : 3.

I thank Thee, Lord, for mine unanswered prayers—
  Unanswered save Thy quiet, kindly "Nay;"
Yet it seemed hard among my heavy cares
  That bitter day.

I wanted joy; but Thou didst know for me
  That sorrow was the gift I needed most,
And in its mystic depths I learned to see
  The Holy Ghost.

I wanted health; but Thou didst bid me sound
  The secret treasuries of pain,
And in the moans and groans my heart oft found
  The Christ again.

I wanted wealth; 'twas not the better part;
  There is a wealth with poverty oft given,
And Thou didst teach me of the gold of heart,
  Best gift of Heaven.

I thank Thee, Lord, for these unanswered prayers.
  And for Thy word, the quiet, kindly "Nay,"
'Twas Thy withholding lightened all my cares
  That blessed day.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
NOV 22 1916
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

TRANSFERRED TO
HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

The
Protestant Review

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."
(1 Cor. 16: 13.)

Vol. XXXIII NOVEMBER, 1916 No. 11

EDITORIAL NOTES

BLIND LEADERS

The astonishing news brought by to-day's mail with regard to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at St. Louis has led me to lay aside some of the material I had prepared for the November and December numbers of THE PROTESTANT REVIEW.

These numbers, by the way, will end my task as editor of this publication.

It seems plain to me that the conditions of the world to-day make any effort to fight evil almost useless, however lofty one's object may be, unless one has such absolute independence that he may dare to combat every form of evil, no matter where it may be found. One of the hardest tasks is to try to expose the errors of others, when we find the very same errors invading our own ranks. Certain resolutions, of which we will speak, have been adopted by the Episcopal Church. Their adoption at this time is an added proof that Protestantism needs to have a check put upon materializing tendencies and to experience a new spiritual awakening, as much as the Roman Church needs a complete transformation.

Any encouragement that has come to me in my ministry of five years at Christ's Mission has been largely from Roman Catholics,—many of them, though still remaining in their own Church, thanking me for breaking their chain of bondage and enlarging their vision. On the other hand, we have many letters from Protestant ministers, discouraging or criticizing us for undertaking a labor both *useless* and *unfitted* for the times in which we live. Some even characterize it as unchristian.

It seems to me that the time has come for the man who feels

an earnest desire for truth and spiritual freedom to call upon all those who are like-minded to follow the path traced out for them under the guidance of another spirit than that which, speaking generally, controls the so-called Christian Churches of to-day. A wide correspondence and experience shows us that the Lord has many of His servants all over the world, upon whom He graciously bestows the Apostolic succession of pure Christian doctrine and practise, and endows them with the gifts of the Holy Spirit as His testimony that He is always with us, even "unto the end of the world." But this succession depends not at all upon outward forms or ceremonies, and often exists entirely apart from them.

The Scriptures speak of the greatest chastisement God allows to come upon man as spiritual blindness. Meditating upon world-conditions to-day, we are forced to acknowledge that this chastisement of blindness is upon the Church to an appalling degree, and that the cause of it is no other than apostasy. We have lost sight of the vision of the "glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," consequently we are unfit to interpret His Word according to His nature. Man has set himself to interpret the Word of God according to his own heart.

But Christianity is not an impenetrable mystery for him who has eyes to see and ears to hear. Our prayer should be, "Lord, that I receive my sight," "Open my eyes that I may see wondrous things out of Thy law!" Its true meaning is unfolded to us by the Holy Spirit.

Christianity did not come to give men earthly power or to create a hierarchy whose members should have dominion over their brethren, but to show all men the way of regeneration, by which they might free themselves of the slavery of their own ways and learn to follow God's ways, thus fitting themselves for the Kingdom, "which is not of this world."

The whole life and teachings of Jesus Christ were a revelation of the uselessness of human means to accomplish, or even begin, that spiritual growth in man which should lead to the attainment of the full measure of perfection. If Jesus had attempted to form an outward organization, some might question the necessity for it in view of the fullness of the Jewish worship and ritual of His time. If His purpose was only to

improve existing conditions, we might even be justified in considering His work a failure. Never did a man who sought the notoriety of a Reformer have better means for the accomplishment of his purpose. The masses, filled with dissatisfaction, were ripe for any movement that would free them from the spiritual bondage of ecclesiastical despotism. A thirst for better things was felt everywhere, even in the realms of philosophical thought, and men like Nicodemus and Gamaliel reveal that this thirst, as well as a sense of justice, were not lacking even in the Sanhedrim. A personality invested with such powers and acknowledged by the multitude could easily control the thought as well as the purse of his time, and undertake a reformation such as the world has never witnessed. But, no! His mission was not that of a Reformer. It was the fulfilment of a Divine commission for the accomplishment of an infinite and eternal purpose. His ways were not man's ways, but God's ways. "In the volume of the Book it is written of Me: I have come to do Thy will, O God." Therefore, although He possessed a controlling power over human forces, He disregarded them as means for the establishment of His Kingdom, and He called, not the wise among men, nor the rich, nor the mighty, but the poor and the weak and the ignorant of this world, so that the work of God might the better be manifested. He centralized the idea and ideal of His work in the Father, and beyond the assurance that He was in the Father, and the Father in Him, and that He was the Way, the Truth and the Life, whereby we must go to the Father, learn of Him and live by Him, He left the perfect knowledge and understanding of His work, and even of His own person and mission on earth, to be revealed by the Comforter who was to come to lead His disciples into "all truth."

He was lifted up on the cross that He might "draw all men unto Him." He assured us that no outward forms or ceremonies would fit men for His Kingdom, as many who called Him "Lord, Lord," would be rejected, and only those could be received who did the will of His Father and whose names were written in the Book of Life, because they were born not of the flesh, but of the Spirit.

If there is a spark of this spiritual life in us let us look, illumined solely by its light, upon the Church of to-day, and we

shall be amazed at how far it has departed from the mind of our Master.

The apostasy of the first centuries has developed into the colossal fraud of the papacy, which has sold the birthright of the children of God—the gifts of the Holy Spirit—for the dominion and power of this present world. It is not strange that this should be so. It would be amazing to any one who knows something of human nature, if it were not so. The strange thing is that, in spite of the difference between the humble Nazarene and the arrogance of the pope, in spite of the contrast between the crown of thorns and the destitution of earthly things of the One who wore it, so that He "had not where to lay His head," and the triple crown, riches and luxury of the Vatican—in spite of all this, so many millions are so blinded that they cannot see, but listen to the presumptuous voice of the pope as though it were an oracle, when he says: *"I am* the supreme ruler, the vicar of Christ."

But the Vatican was not built in a day, nor the pope proclaimed supreme, upon awakening from a dream of power. It was brought about as the result of prolonged human effort, a sincere, though misdirected, desire for good being the motive force in many cases. In this consists the power of evil, that it can assume such an aspect of good as to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. The same evil which has always been alive in human nature has invaded the Church of the Reformation. It has shown its tendencies in all existing denominations in varying degrees and has crystalized in a more definite form as a special movement within the Protestant Episcopal Church.

My intention is not to criticize personalities, or to imply that any one is not moved by good-will and sincere purpose; but, as we know there is a zeal which is not according to knowledge, and therefore is not of God, there are also tendencies which lead men away from God, and many are blinded thereby.

I realize the difficulty of presenting a clear fact to one who cannot or will not see, therefore I may be misinterpreted, although I try to make my thought clear to all by simple language. There are many who will see so much good and no harm in the resolutions already adopted, and in process of adoption, by the Protestant Episcopal Church that they will class me among the

"bigots." But if they could have any idea of the experiences through which I have passed they would understand that God had permitted them that I might be able to recognize certain evils, even in the mere seed-form, and that therefore I speak as I do.

(To be continued.)

AN AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUANDARY*

To the Editor of "The Chronicle,"

Dear Sir—I am in a strait betwixt two and am in dire need of counsel. I am a staunch American Catholic without friendship or feeling for an outcast Protestant Episcopalian. I hate the abbreviation P. E. as I love and dote on the abbreviation A. C. P stands for Protestantism, Panama, Poughkeepsie; A stands for American, Anglican and sometimes for Adullam. A. C. indicates that I am an American Catholic and also an American Citizen, and no wonder the conjunction of letters fills me with pride. But here is the rub. The two leading candidates for the Presidency in the November elections are, according to Catholic teaching, schismatics. One is a Presbyterian and the other is a Baptist. Naturally I want to cast my ballot and fulfil my duties as a citizen of this Republic. But can I exercise my citizenship and consistently retain my catholicity? Can I, as an American Catholic, go to the polls and vote for a Baptist or a Presbyterian without countenancing schism and using my efforts to put schismatics into high office? Protestantism is an abomination to me, and the thought of it chills my soul. With a schismatic at the helm of the nation, I fear that we may be steering toward such a dreadful religious conference as was recently held at Panama. In contemplation of the prospect, I feel like skidooing to Adullam. Any counsel "The Chronicle" can give me in my perplexity will be gratefully appreciated by a doleful

AMERICAN CATHOLIC.

*The writer mixes up religion and politics. This is confusing. His religion does not seem intended to mix with his life anyhow. We would advise him to rent a box in some bank, deposit his religion there, where no one else can get at it, and then go down to the polls and vote the Prohibition ticket, and read "The Living Church" for sake of the Blue Monday musings; any old numbers will suffice.—*Editor.*

CATHOLICISM CONTRA MUNDUM

The recent congress of the Federation of Catholic Societies in America was an imposing, because suggestive, spectacle. It was no merely fraternal gathering. It was essentially a declaration of fundamental principles. It made clear the issues upon which the Roman Catholic Church in America is prepared to make a bold stand. It revealed with refreshing frankness the terms upon which it is conceived right to admit loyalty to the Republic. It made plain the accuracy of the old Roman vaunt that the Church is unchanging. All the old dogmas were reiterated. The antagonism to modern sociology was almost passionately defined. The President's Mexican policy was condemned, not in its national, but in its religious aspect. Rarely have we been given a more direct revelation of ultimate purpose.

"The New Republic" has already stated its attitude on these problems. It has asserted that education, philanthropy, political policy can be conducted only on the basis of the completest experimental knowledge. It is fundamentally uninterested in a revelation which does not derive its justification from the progressive experience of men. The issue so defined has been accepted by Father Blakely on behalf of his Church, in an article that recently appeared in "America." He takes his stand against the sociology "whose attack is directed not against the Catholic Church alone, but against the very foundations of revealed religion." He objects to making the American State function in any fashion save that which is acceptable to his Church. The use of modern educational resources in the training of the child is, as he conceives, simply its paganization. He is opposed to every phase of social policy which does not obtain Catholic approval. The modern attitude, he urges, "is a blind, unquestioning acceptance of the complete supremacy of a godless community over every phase of human activity." Such a supremacy he can never admit. A life lived on terms unsanctioned by an infallible papacy seems to him impious and unfruitful.

It is no chance pronouncement he has made. His thought found vigorous endorsement in the orations of the three cardinals to the Catholic Congress. While they reiterated their loyalty to America, they made it clear that such loyalty was conditioned.

They demanded in return the right of their Church to the fullest development of which it is capable. They demanded for it the power to live its life on its own terms, for the purposes it deems the most sacred. It was only when such privilege was conceded that their attachment to America could be genuine and full.

Theoretically that position is unassailable. But when it is translated into concrete terms of the event it is seen to be an attitude full of the gravest implications. The cardinals—and particularly Cardinal O'Connell—were emphatic that in her own sphere the Church must be supreme. No one denies it. Religious liberty is one of the principles most inherent in our national life. We tolerate every kind and degree of ecclesiastical attitude so long as its work is confined to religious endeavor. The problem of Catholic America is simply and frankly this—that its work is not so confined. The Roman Church has purposes to fulfil, has positions to maintain, that seem incompatible with the progress of the community. It is the official propagandist of obscurantism. It stands four-square against most efforts to advance scientific knowledge. What Father Blakely repudiates as "paganism" is simply an effort to make the American child aware of the ethical implications of democracy, a determination to bring it into contact with all that may develop the good of which it is capable. That must be the unceasing effort of every one at all careful of our national life. It means an attitude which recognizes the importance of Darwin no less than of Aquinas. It insists that however significant be the revelation accorded to St. Paul, that is no reason for believing that we must limit our interpretation of the world to his philosophy or Rome's conception of it. We resent the effort of the Roman Church so to define its freedom as to make it the badge of other people's servitude. We deny the right of any one, be he Catholic or Protestant or Jew, to remain consistently ignorant of the march of the human mind. Cardinal O'Connell may trace this war to the wickedness of Huxley, of Haeckel and of Kant; but he thereby reveals only his complete indifference to the character of their achievements. It is time that he realized how infinite is our ignorance; time, too, that he should understand how little likely we are to progress by elevating our lack of knowledge to the position of a primary virtue. We do not forget the attitude of

Rome to Giordano Bruno and to Galileo; we regret its extension to twentieth century America.

The Roman Church must realize that liberty is a relative concept and that we cannot each one of us do as we will. The modern democracy, for example, has decided to permit divorce. While no one denies the right of the Roman Church to deny divorce to members of its communion, one does object to its stigmatization of divorce as sin for those outside its membership. One does object to its policy of advocating separate schools—as if arithmetic or logic or chemistry could be better taught on Catholic principles or had some mystic relation to the Catholic religion. If the loyalty of Catholics is dependent on our admission of these things we cannot secure their adherence. If they believe that their religion demands that they govern their charitable institutions on antiquated and unintelligent principles, the fact that the subjects of their philanthropy are citizens of the State constitutes ground for interference and control. We have been told by Cardinal O'Connell that his replies to anxious inquiry must be sufficient and go unquestioned. We reply that no answer replete with political significance can be accorded the privilege of infallibility. America is no hierarchy, like medieval Europe, with the papacy spiritually at our head. Had we any desire to acknowledge its desirability the spectacle of French Canada, made invincibly obscurantist by the efforts of Rome, would be sufficient to secure us from yielding to it. We can reject no weapon which promises knowledge on the ground that it is not found in the Roman armory. We must demand the investigation of all things. We shall judge well of institutions like the Roman Church in so far as they contribute to the scientific conquest of our environment. An institution which calls men like Huxley and Darwin and Kant evil and monstrous, can hardly free itself from our suspicion. A Rome such as this is out of harmony with the needs of the modern State. It is constituting itself visibly and consciously the barrier to our progress. It looks for its truths in the past. It defines the meaning of good to be no more than acceptance of its ancient dogmas. The verdict of a sovereign elected by the chance vote of a political conclave it asks us to accept as divinely infallible. The Church which within a generation cast out a Döllinger, the greatest theological

historian of the nineteenth century, and within our time has officially stamped as impious that modernist movement which asked no more than the right of free inquiry, can hardly command our confidence. . . .

The fact is that the modern Church is partly a political power and as a political power she has to be treated. That is why our attitude to American Catholicism must differ radically from our attitude to American Protestantism or American Judaism. The pope is sovereign of a State none the less real because it is unterritorial in character. He is aiming at the victory of certain principles conceived as ultimate, and he is prepared to provoke conflict with all who come into antagonism with his aims. Ruler as he is by divine right, holding, in the power of the keys, the gateway to salvation, infallible in every *ex cathedra* pronouncement, knowing no limit to a power which he only can define, he is without doubt a formidable antagonist. It is as a great sovereign that he must be treated. . . .—From The New Republic.

HAVE WE AN OBJECTIVE? WHAT IS IT?

We get on a train, and in so doing we put our lives in the hands of the engineer and the conductor and the brakeman. We are helpless while they control affairs; they can carry us to our destination or not; they can wreck the train or not—as they choose. But when we buy our ticket and enter the train we do not surrender our freedom or our individuality—not intentionally, at least. We simply permit the trainmen to render us a service, for which they are paid. We have the utmost faith in their good intentions.

And so in governmental affairs. We choose Legislators, and give them tremendous power. They can wreck the nation—they can plunge us into war—they can ruin us commercially. But we have freely chosen to put them in control, and we have faith in their good intentions and their ability to do the right thing.

What a muddle there would be were every passenger to attempt to run the train, or every voter attempt to run the Government!

Now, in this great patriotic movement we are supposed to be aiming at something, or going somewhere. Ninety-nine per cent. of us fix upon one man—the hundredth man—to be the engineer, and then we give him a few assistants. These men, whom we have chosen, have the power to wreck and ruin; *but they are our choice.* We believe in them; we will heed them until the time comes to make a change.

That is how it should be.

Now we are on the train, bound for Podunk, or Washington, which? Skunk's Misery or Albany? Cuttyhunk or Chicago?

If our movement is big and important, "majestic in its sweep," something big is expected of us. If we are to revise statutes, build new laws and choose congresses, cabinets and Presidents, then should our train be headed in that direction.

What is our objective as a great patriotic movement? Is it not to save our nation from the intrigue of political foes? to preserve all that is best in our Government, and to safeguard cherished American ideals?

What does this mean? Well—

1st. Our Constitution guarantees freedom of worship, freedom of the press, freedom of speech—within the law of the land.

This is all contrary to the dogma and the practise of the Church of Rome, as revealed in her history. Her position is, as quoted in Lecky's "Democracy," from Veuillot: "Where *Protestants* are in the majority we demand entire freedom, for that is *their* doctrine; where *we* are in the majority, we refuse such freedom, for that is *our* doctrine."

That the Church of Rome has made most vicious onslaughts upon freedom of worship, freedom of the press and freedom of speech, not only in foreign lands, but here in the United States in the past year, is everywhere known—even resorting to assassination to prevent such freedom.

Here is one great objective for our movement—to guard the blood-bought freedom.

2d. Our statutes say that the marriage of any two persons, legally qualified, by a Protestant minister or other legal official, is a true marriage and the children of such marriage are legitimate.

The Church of Rome says ("Ne Temere" decree) that unless

the marriage is in harmony with her Church laws (married by a priest, etc.), such a marriage is "no marriage at all," the parties are living in concubinage, and the children are illegitimate.

Here is an "imperium in imperio"—a government within a government—a religious sect flying into the face of our statute law and enforcing her decrees all over the land.

Here is another objective for our great movement—to put upon our statute books such laws as will severely punish treasonable acts of priests in nullifying these laws.

3d. The American people, from almost their earliest history, have built up and protected our public school system—always referred to as "one of the bulwarks of our nation."

The Church of Rome, from pope down to priest, declare that our public schools must be destroyed, and in many places the priests, by various tricks and subterfuges, are actually destroying these schools, as in New York, Chicago and other places where their conspiracies have been unearthed.

Here is an objective which will draw to our ranks hundreds of thousands who at present have no interest in our general movement.

4th. Our Constitution, in its spirit if not in actual words, says that there shall be no union of Church and State—thus forbidding the granting of money from the public treasury to any religious sect.

The Church of Rome stands with perpetually outstretched hands, begging for public money for her institutions, and millions of dollars of money of the taxpayers are being given to her.

Here, too, is a very important point for our work, and the taxation of Church property should be here included.

5th. Our Constitution guarantees freedom of person within the law to every individual, and no imprisonment "without due process of law."

Every day in the year, without any "process of law," young girls are committed to papal prisons, such as the so-called "Houses of the Good Shepherd," are kept there indefinitely—usually so long as they are able to earn money for these institutions, in their laundries—and are not only kept in ignorance, without educational facilities, but are compelled to associate with the most hardened street-walkers—many of the girls of

fourteen and a little over getting their first lessons in vice in these institutions.

And women in papal convents are also held "without due process of law."

This objective for our efforts will shortly arouse national interest, as it has in France, Italy and other papal lands.

6th. Our Legislators have put upon the statute books certain laws requiring the inspection of buildings in which are a number of people—inspection by men in the health and fire departments, and in the labor departments of our States. Thus all laundries come under these laws, as well as convents, parochial schools and similar institutions.

These laws are *dead* so far as their application to papal institutions is concerned. Not even health and fire inspectors are admitted to convents, and census-takers are refused reliable information. Labor union men close their eyes to infractions of rules in the Houses of the Good Shepherd, and factory inspectors do not visit them. Not one in ten of these papal institutions has fire-escapes and the most of them are wholly unsanitary.

A short time ago an epidemic of typhoid fever broke out in a Pennsylvania convent, and twenty-one children were burned to death in a parochial school in Peabody, Mass., through violations of the statutes *-and in both cases the priests bulldozed the legal authorities into silence.*

Another objective for our efforts.

7th. Every country in the world, except the United States, has at some time in its history driven out the Jesuits—most papal lands doing this many times, and some popes have attempted to suppress the order. Why was this? *Because the Jesuits plot against all Governments, destroy all nations, are detested and suspected wherever known.*

NOW NOTE CAREFULLY—*The Jesuits absolutely control the Church of Rome to-day, in the United States as elsewhere.* We hear but little about them, because they know their reputation is bad, and they work through tools who are not known as Jesuits.

These are the fellows who are massing their forces in Washington and filling high offices in our Government.

We have before us a private note from a well-known public man, who knows what he is talking about. He says: *"The entire Secret Service of the United States is strictly papal,"* and that spells "JESUIT!" The whole world knows that the "black pope" (head of the Jesuits) is over the "white pope" (Benedict), and that the cardinals are the puppets of the black pope.

Here is a great objective—WATCH WASHINGTON!

8th. Here is where the train has many spur tracks and "locals"—all of them important, viz., in the election of *right men* to the Legislatures and to Congress. If we are to be successful in combatting all the evils referred to, we must make the primaries and the polls, as well as public sentiment, an objective.

9th. And now comes the *traitor within the camp—the stupid, ignorant, treacherous and selfish Protestant,* who tries to hinder our work, and cries out: *"You are discriminating against Roman Catholics!" "You are bringing religion into politics!"*

Here is our standpoint: *American citizens with an American spirit are better qualified to deal with city, State and national problems, and to make and administer laws for Americans, than are the subjects of a foreign potentate whose dogmas are wholly foreign and opposed to the American Constitution and to American institutions.*

* * * * * *

Now here is gigantic work cut out for us—greater than building the Panama Canal or tunneling the Rocky Mountains. It more resembles the GREAT WAR IN EUROPE. *We must be trained, armed and entrenched!* IT IS CERTAINLY A FIGHT WORTHY OF OUR GREAT INSTITUTION.

We must work as a unit; have confidence in our leaders; call out the reserves; enlist all whom we can reach; "trust in God and keep our powder dry."

Overlook the trifles and aim at big things.

A great problem is: How shall we treat our worst enemy—the skulking Protestants?

WE'RE IN THIS WAR TO STAY!—The American Citizen.

A NEW DOGMA

BY THE EDITOR.

The European Catholic papers have published that the pope has expressed his intention of declaring the Assumption of the Virgin as a dogma of the Church as soon as the war comes to an end.

The last three popes expressed the same desire when there was no war to prevent them from carrying it out. So this prospective move seems very similar to the pope's often-announced intention of leaving the Vatican, which has no other object than to take the pulse of public sentiment.

It is not our purpose in this article to detract in the least from the exalted character of Mary. Fully accepting as we do the divinity of Christ, it follows but as a natural sequence of this belief that the great mystery of our redemption should have been accomplished by supernormal means, one of the requisites being the perfect purity of the instrument prepared for the uniting of the divine with the human nature in the person of the only Mediator between God and man.

The mystery begins and ends in one Person, Jesus Christ, the Alpha and the Omega, the Author and Finisher of our faith. His is the only name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. "No man," said He, "cometh unto the Father, but by Me."

Mary was chosen for a lofty purpose—to be the mother of Christ's humanity. The prophecy of His manifestation in the flesh pointed to a "Virgin," and the Angel of the Annunciation called her "blessed among women." We may believe that her whole life led up to the fulfilment of her great special mission, which was fulfilled at Bethlehem. After that she became simply the handmaid of the Lord, the humble disciple of her holy Son. The dignity and nobility of soul which shine forth in the few simple words which refer to her in the Gospels are enhanced by her attitude of deep humility, but nowhere is divinity ascribed to her in the Scriptures. I do not see how we can give Mary the title of "Mother of God" without giving her the title of "God," consequently ascribing divinity to her mother, and so back throughout her line of ancestry forming a succession of "gods."

But it is not our purpose to treat of this question here. Our object is only to show how Rome works, and how so many corruptions have crept into the pure teachings of the Gospel.

We do not know the origin of the story of the assumption of Mary to Heaven. All we certainly know on the subject is that the so-called Apostolic traditions referring to it, the definitions of early Church councils, and many other writings brought forward in its support, are forgeries and are recognized as such by the Church's own authorities.

The mere fact that it was not declared a dogma many centuries ago ought to make people reflect that either its defenders were lacking in veracity, or the Church has been criminally neglectful with regard to a thing so essential. For when it becomes a dogma, belief in it will be necessary for salvation for the living, and the dead who did not believe in it will, *ipse facto,* be condemned of error, and among these are many popes and many saints recognized as "doctors" by the Church.

It is a mystery how people can allow themselves to be so blinded. How can any one believe in the infallibility of the pope in presence of facts such as these? We have here a doctrine of the Church which no doubt will sooner or later be declared a dogma. In all probability this glory will be for the present pope or his immediate successor. We must acknowledge that either Divine revelation is very slow in its processes, or that an almost superhuman disposition is required to receive it; in which case, if the present pope is the favored one, we must concede that he has reached a greater degree of perfection than his predecessors. Of this perfection no one should be better able to judge than his contemporaries. When we see there is no store of supernatural knowledge or wisdom at his disposal for the solution of the complicated problems of these times of crisis, when we are in such need of heavenly guidance, we must conclude that the papacy has brought down to our day very little of the real spirit of the Apostles, in spite of its claims to Apostolic Succession.

But this subject may teach us something more, if we observe the reasons given by the supporters of the proposed dogma, and, if we live to see it declared such, the reasons the pope himself will give in his bull of promulgation. It will not only be based upon

spurious authorities, but will be said to be a response to the longings and petitions of the universal Church –that is, the Church in all ages and all countries.

The declaration of a new dogma, according to the method invariably employed by the Church, amounts to a vindication of the consensus of opinion of the Church, as if the pope should say: "You, the members of the Church in all ages, have been right, and my predecessors have been wrong; therefore, let it be as you would have it." Where, then, is "papal infallibility"?

But the proceedings of the Church with regard to the declaration of dogmas are the same as those she employs in any other particular field, whether political, literary or scientific. By long and painful experience the Church has learned the evil of haste and the bitter humiliation of retraction. The thousands of spurious saints that the Bolandists have been obliged to remove from the calendar, the blunders made in the trials of Galileo, Joan of Arc, and the Inquisition in general, besides other false steps, call up bitter memories which serve to warn the Church against incautious haste. So she has learned to assume an attitude of "watchful waiting," never revealing herself or her purpose, but by a long course of deception covering all traces of her secret workings until the time seems ripe for open action.

A good instance of this is the mode of procedure in the canonization of saints. The pope, if he really holds the keys of Heaven, ought to know whether a person is a saint or not; nevertheless, no move is made toward canonizing any one until one or two, or even more, centuries after his death; unless, of course, there should be a great popular movement like that which took place after the death of St. Francis of Assisi, and which obliged the Church to act quickly in the matter of his canonization, out of fear for her own security. The usual method is to start circulating marvelous stories about the prospective saint. One would like to prove these stories; one would like to get hold of eye-witnesses of the miracles, but, alas, all are dead! These tales serve to excite the imagination of the credulous, and gradually lead up to the process of canonization, which is conducted with a great show of scientific and careful

investigation of so-called facts, which in many cases are groundless, or at best much distorted.

It is common for the defenders of the Church to credit her with being the fountain-head of science, as well as of art and literature, and many scientists of the past are now made out to be devout sons of the Church. We are not told how greatly they have differed from the Church in their beliefs, nor what efforts the Church has put forth to hinder them. To be strictly truthful, the Church should acknowledge her indebtedness to them and not try to appropriate as her own original work the good they have accomplished through sheer courage and force of character in spite of her deadening influence.

In the realm of politics the Church has scored her successes by following the same method, cunningly hiding her purpose and working out her secret plans with a patience worthy of a better cause. Under the cloak of spirituality, and with the avowed purpose of "betterment" and "uplift," she has sent out her emissaries armed with instructions appropriate to the country and the circumstances. To any student of history the many political failures of the Church are apparent and the secret of whatever victory she has gained has consisted in turning the cross into a sword. Raising it, hilt upward, and concealing the keen blade and point from view, she calls the people about her standard, but when she once establishes her supremacy over them, she turns the cross the other way, disclosing the terrible emblem of destruction to those who still dare to oppose her.

If Rome had not proclaimed the Gospel and appropriated to herself the principal dogmas of Christianity, she would have inevitably succumbed to the mortal wounds inflicted upon her in the political field. So the true explanation of the Church's successes is not that she is a Christian institution founded upon Christian principles, but that she has been clever enough to so modify and adapt Christianity and its principles as to further her own ambitions.

Going back to the subject of the proposed dogma, there was a time when such an innovation could not but have met with great opposition, and, in fact, it was the cause of bitter enmity between different religious orders. Fictitious stories of reve-

lations and apparitions were accepted by the ignorant masses who are always in the majority, for the popes restricted controversies on this subject to the confines of the monasteries and seminaries, and guarded themselves by maintaining a neutral attitude, always, however, surreptitiously encouraging fraud and curbing its opponents. The only reason why the popes have not yet dared to proclaim this dogma is that they fear the opposition to it has not even to-day died out as completely as they could wish, and the announcements made from time to time that it is about to be proclaimed have no other object than to test the effect of the suggestion upon the world of thought and observe the trend of opposing arguments in order to fortify Rome's position.

The lesson we want to bring home to our Catholic friends is this: If the pope is infallible, he ought to know whether the Virgin Mary was received up bodily into Heaven or not. If he knows she was, he ought to proclaim it—and not only that, but it ought to have been proclaimed by the first pope.

If the pope cannot assert a fact of this nature by reason of his authority, but the proclamation of a dogma must be forced upon him by the persistent petitions of Christendom, it follows that infallibility belongs to the universal Church and not at all to the pope. Why, then, does the pope claim for himself such infallibility and exact unquestioning obedience from every member of the Church? If we can induce our devout Catholic friends to reflect upon this anomaly, it may lead the way to the investigation of the many other contradictions and inconsistencies of Rome, and to the liberation of their hearts and wills from spiritual bondage, for which we pray.

ADORATION

A DIALOGUE.

Does the Protestant Episcopal Church Sanction Adoration?

Conversation Between a Puzzled Parishioner and His Rector.

Parishioner: I have been reading one of the "Holy Cross Tracts," which declares that our Church teaches Eucharistic Adoration. It gives quotations from our martyred Bishop Ridley and from nine other prominent English divines in support of this statement. I have also been following the controversy in the columns of the "Churchman" between Mr. Hughson, one of the Holy Cross fathers, and Dr. Griffith Thomas on this subject. Each of them appeals to the authority of our English divines—one affirming that they teach Eucharistic Adoration, the other denying it. Now, my dear Rector, how is a layman to decide when theologians differ so sharply and quote the same divines in support of opposite opinions?

Rector: I think, my dear sir, that if you carefully examine Dr. Thomas' reply to Mr. Hughson you will find that he completely establishes his position. But let me call your attention to the judgment expressed by a writer who stands in the front rank of liturgical and patristic scholars of the nineteenth century; I mean Archdeacon Freeman. In his monumental work, "The Principles of Divine Service" (vol. II., p. 185) he says: "The practice of making an intense act of worship consequent on the consecration of the elements and directed toward a peculiar Presence of Christ Himself, supposed to be produced thereby," was "unheard of until the eleventh or twelfth century." Another great scholar, Palmer, in his *"Origines Liturgicae,"* (vol. II, p. 16) says: "The elevation of the sacrament for the purpose of adoration was not practised in the Christian Church for eleven hundred years after Christ." Another distinguished scholar, Canon Trevor, says: "Nothing is read of Eucharistic Adoration in the purest ages, beyond receiving the elements in a posture of reverence scarcely equal to our own order of kneeling."

Parishioner: But the advocates of Eucharistic Adoration quote passages from St. Augustine, from St. Cyril, from St.

Ambrose, St. Chrysostom and Theodoret, in support of Eucharistic Adoration, all of the fourth century.

Rector: Let me point out to you that the five brief passages quoted from these fathers of the fourth century are absolutely all that the most learned investigation has been able to discover in the whole vast mass of patristic literature which give any appearance of support to Eucharistic Adoration. They constitute a frail foundation indeed for so tremendous a doctrine—for the practise cannot be separated from the doctrine. Two of the passages do not touch the question at issue. The others are ambiguous. For instance, when Augustine says: "No one eats that flesh unless he first adores," it is evident from other passages in his writing that he does not mean adoration of the elements, but adoration of Christ. Our great divine, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, so understands it. He says: "No man eats Christ's body worthily, but he first adores Christ." The passage from St. Cyril, in the opinion of Archdeacon Freeman, "is only to the effect that the elements are to be received in a posture of adoration."

Let me also call your attention to the testimony of the ancient liturgies which, as Freeman points out, are more weighty and trustworthy than ecclesiastical writers for the determination of eucharistic questions. "In vain," says Freeman, "is the last shadow of countenance for proper worship of the elements, or of a Eucharistic Presence, sought for," in them. And he continues: "The devout prostration and adoration which took place was not addressed to the elements or to any presence of God or Christ on earth. It was . . . expressly directed to God, or Christ, in Heaven." (Id., p. 173.)

Parishioner: Nevertheless, is it not a Catholic practise?

Rector: No, because nothing can be Catholic which has not prevailed always and everywhere and among all. As Bishop Andrewes, one of the great divines of the seventeenth century, says: "That which has prevailed always and everywhere, and among all, that which has been believed always, everywhere and by all—let that be Catholic! That rule of itself is the death of all your opinions which have crept in surreptitiously."

Parishioner: Still I am puzzled by the quotation from such divines as Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Bramhall, Bishop Cosin

and Bishop Beveridge, who seem to give countenance to the practise.

Rector: This approval by these and other great divines is only apparent. In every case investigation shows that they had reference to the adoration of Christ and not to the adoration of the sacrament, or of Christ in the sacrament. Thus, Bishop Cosin says: "The Adoration of the elements is a late device of the new Roman Catholics after they had brought in their novelty of transsubstantiation." Bishop Jeremy Taylor declares: "This Adoration is an act of idolatry, in giving divine honor to a mere creature." He adds: "If it had been intended we should worship the holy sacrament, the Holy Scriptures would have . . . bidden us in express terms to have adored it;" Bishop Andrewes also "carefully distinguishes the 'veneration due to the symbols from the divine adoration belonging to Christ.'" He censures Bellarime's expression of "adoring Christ in the sacrament," as a "shameful stumble on the threshold." He refers to the passage quoted from St. Ambrose, and says: "We also 'adore the flesh of Christ in the "mysteries," yet not that thing (id), but Him (eum), who above (not upon) the altar is worshiped'" (Resp. ad Bellarminum). Thus Andrewes, distinguished sharply between the veneration due to the symbols and the adoration due to Christ. He has no word to say of our Lord's presence in, with, or under, the bread and wine in the holy eucharist.

Parishioner: "But does not Dr. Mortimer, who used to be recognized as an authority by the Catholic party, admit that the adoration of the elements would be idolatry?

Rector: Yes, but Freeman warns us "that the doctrine and practise of Eucharistic Adoration, however reverently intended, cannot consistently stop short of the highest irreverence, that of worshiping the elements themselves—confessedly an idolatrous action." (Id., p. 187.) Against the practise this great scholar makes this strong appeal: "With the utmost solemnity, in the name of the Christian faith, and of the whole undivided Church for the first thousand years of its existence, I would enter a most earnest protest against the reintroduction of novelties at once so groundless and so fatal." (Id., p. 186.) Let me also call your attention, my dear sir, to these words of Bishop Cosin: "The real presence of Christ in the eucharist means His real

reception in the soul of the communicant. There is no presence to any but the communicant, nor to them without faith." (History of Transsubstantiation, I., I.) In another place he says: "The adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself, and neither is, nor ought to be, directed to any external, sensible object, such as the blessed elements."

He quotes with approval the words of St. Augustine: "Why dost thou prepare thy stomach and thy teeth? *Believe, and thou hast eaten!*" And he identifies his belief with that of the Protestant Churches of the Continent, saying: "None of the Protestant Churches doubt the real, that is, the true and unimaginary presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament."

Published by The Chronicle Press for distribution by The Protestant Episcopal Society for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge.

[We are glad to take this opportunity of recommending to our readers "The Chronicle" as one of the most excellent publications of its kind in this country.]

SEQUESTRATION OF THE PERSON

The following is a point that, it seems to me, should be thoroughly threshed out and understood by the public at large, which at present is in a condition of the most absolute ignorance as regards human rights, and while we prate about the right of each citizen of this "grand and glorious Republic" to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, we tolerate, and even permit, conditions to not only exist, but flourish, which deprive thousands and thousands of men and women of the second, and, incidentally, of the first and last of these human rights. I am referring here to the unfortunate victims of a system, monstrous and outworn, at least in the minds of those who have attained any intellectual growth and are endeavoring to perfect and carry out the ideals of true democracy in its spiritual conception: "Freedom for all, and God, Himself, our Ruler."

Now to the question under consideration. I have understood that, for many years, it has been contrary to law to immure and sequestrate the person of any citizen in a country governed by free institutions, unless for the purpose of restraining him

from assaulting the person or property of others, or in punishment for such assaults. The places employed for such purposes are termed penitentiaries or prisons, and, in cases of lunacy, asylums and madhouses.

Granting, in our present degree of limited enlightenment as to the causes leading to crimes against law and order, that such places are necessary and legally permissible, and only for the purpose specified, namely, the protection of the rest of the community, I would ask why, especially in a Republic like ours, any so-called Church or ecclesiastical organization, or corporation, should be permitted to immure and sequestrate the persons of thousands and thousands of men and women who might otherwise become useful and valuable members of the community to which they by right belong, to say nothing of appropriating money and property belonging to such persons and which should, of right, revert to their heirs or to the State for the good of the public, at their death, and not be employed merely for the temporal aggrandizement of an avaricious and ambitious hierarchy?

Setting aside all other considerations, is it in conformity with the law of the land and the declaration of principles laid down in our Constitution, that any citizens, male or female, should be deprived of their liberty and forced to spend their best years behind prison walls, where most of them die in the prime of life, and not for any crime, but in order to build up the power of a cruel, arrogant system that terrorizes and humiliates those whom it seeks to control?

I know my statement will be refuted by the counter-statement that none are obliged to remain in a monastery or convent if they wish to leave. But this can be disproved through the testimony of many witnesses. Also, if they were permitted to leave so readily, why is it considered such a scandal when a monk or nun succeeds in making an escape, and why is every effort used to entrap and bring such a one back to the convent? These incarcerated monks and nuns are under constant espionage, and every precaution is taken to make their escape impossible.

The question may be raised: Are these people citizens and under the protection of our laws, or are they subjects of the pope merely, and subject only to the jurisdiction of Rome and

its minions? If so, they have no right in this country. It seems to me, as it must to any reasoning person, that this question should be taken up and thoroughly threshed out.

The Roman Catholic Church is a mendicant Church, supported by the Protestants and Jews, as well as by the hard-earned pennies of its faithful and, for the most part, ignorant followers, and the donations of some of its wealthier patrons. But it is the poor whose ill-repaid toil has done the most to build up these stately, commanding edifices that may be seen throughout our land. Practically every office and store in New York and other cities knows the black-robed sisters, who come in silently and mutely appeal for alms, since open begging is now forbidden. And at every pay day all classes of workmen are approached by these same mendicants -for what are they but mendicants? If the Protestant Churches were to send around beggars to solicit alms in a similar manner, we should hear about it in no measured terms.

"But see how much good they do," says some one. Yes, they get the credit for it, but it is the kind-hearted Jew baker, or the Protestant grocer, or butcher, all of whom, of course, are heretics and doomed to perdition, according to Romish teaching, who really deserve the credit.

But we have wandered from our point—the legal right of Rome to sequestrate the person. Will not some lawyer give this matter his consideration and also enlighten us as to whether, under the guise of religion, any Church or ecclesiastical corporation is empowered to withdraw those who should be citizens from the rights and duties of citizenship.

CATHERINE WALTERS.

BEWARE OF POPERY IN POLITICS!

The history of the Roman Catholic Church covers 1,400 years, and has been written. When Roman Catholics control a country it begins to decline. Control—this is the secret aim and desire of the leaders of the Church. Control of conscience, of mind, family, marriage, truth, education, schools, parliament and press. Lovers of liberty, eh? The Church entered the political realm and secured and retained temporal power for centuries. History proves that the Roman Catholic Church became corrupt and immoral, and through one revolution after another lost much of its power.

It is believed by millions of intelligent people that the Roman Catholic Church is trying to regain her lost position of temporal power and glory as she enjoyed it in the Middle Ages. I believe that. That Church, having lost power in the old world, is trying to gain it in the new world. Having lost her grip in the countries where she is old and well known—France, Portugal, Spain and Italy—she is seeking for a fresh lease of power in England, United States and Canada.

Any attempt to dominate in the political field will be resisted by Protestant, Jew, Agnostic and intelligent Roman Catholics. The holy father will not rule the United States nor Canada. Every blundering step of prelates, like at the recent banquet, only hastens the day when we will have to thresh out once and forever the question of the State being supreme. We'll rule ourselves. We'll govern our educational institutions. We'll be free. Every attempt to place the person of the pope in contrast to the king will cause trouble. Whatever the pope is inside his Church, he's only a man outside his Church. You can make him anything you like inside the Church, but we Protestants can't worship him. To us he is only a man, chosen by men, supported by men.

The pope does not represent Christ on earth—he represents only the Roman Catholics. The best representative of Christ on earth is the one most like Christ.

Whenever you find Roman Catholics trying to regain power you'll find an anti-Roman Catholic party. It's so in England, Canada, United States and South America. It's the old story the world over.—Rev. James L. Gordon, D.D.

THE WORLD'S EMPTY CONTINENT

BY JAMES M. TAYLOR.

Chile, like all South America, is claimed as a Roman Catholic country; they publish that 98½ per cent. of the population are members of the Roman Church. It is possible that this per cent. of the population have been baptized by the priests, though we doubt it. Even if this is true, the men are rarely ever seen in the church, and during a demonstration against the pope's representative in Chile, the streets of Santiago and Valparaiso were crowded with many thousand men, shouting against the Roman Church, and they stopped in front of the Protestant church and cried out, "Long live the Protestant Church!" The Roman Church, in claiming 98½ per cent. of all the people, has to admit that perhaps two-thirds of them are of illegitimate birth, while tens of thousands of the most devout Roman Catholics are living together without being married.

In Brazil, Uruguay, Ecuador, Venezuela and Paraguay the population is illegitimate to the extent of 18, 27, 50, 58 and 90 per cent., respectively.

The following incident would be ludicrous and laughable if it were not connected with a funeral and graveyard. A prominent missionary, who is very conservative in his statements and has spent more than a quarter of a century in Roman Catholic countries, told us of a certain priest who died in the town where our missionary friend was laboring. They had covered the priest's coffin with white roses, using these as an emblem of his purity. One of the chief mourners present said between her sobs, "Oh, yes, everybody knows that 'father' was a saint! I know he was a saint, for he is the father of my eleven children, and they are all little saints just like their father (the priest)." She continued her weeping over the death of the supposed saint of God, who as an impure man had dragged her down to a life of shame and was the father of her eleven children.

Not more than 10 per cent. of the priests are living pure lives.

The following incident is a good illustration of the hatred for God's Word and the ability of converted Catholics to endure persecution for Christ's sake. Dr. Craver, a missionary, had sold a Bible to a young man. He read it, and when he went to

confession the priest secured from him a confession of the fact that he had committed the awful sin of reading God's Word. The penance put upon him by the priest for this awful sin was to get down on the brick floor of the church and with his tongue make a cross on every brick in the floor.

The young man did his penance, but God's Word had done its work. Later on he gave his heart to Christ. His father was very much enraged and tied the boy by his thumbs and pulled the rope up over a beam until he could barely reach the ground with his toes. In this position the father gave him a horse-whipping. But through it all the boy remained true to God and bore a testimony to the keeping power of the Holy Ghost.

Speaking generally, there are no doctors outside of the larger towns. There is an appalling prevalence of disease. A doctor in Paraguay estimates that 90 per cent. of the people of that country are afflicted with venereal disease. Leprosy is very common. At least 1 per cent. of the people in Paraguay are lepers, and the number is increasing. Nothing whatever is done for them, and they mix freely with the rest of the people.

In China each missionary worker has a parish of about 1,100 square miles.

The missionary worker in India must cover an area of only 350 square miles, about a third the size of that of his brother in China. The missionary worker in Brazil, however, has a parish of 15,000 square miles, or about the size of Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut combined, or equal to half the size of Scotland. If we consider inland South America—it has some forty missionaries; its area is over 3,000,000 square miles, giving a parish of about 76,000 square miles to each missionary.

South America is empty educationally. In Brazil 85 per cent. of the population is illiterate—only 3 per cent. in school; in Chile, 5 per cent.; in the United States, 17 per cent. of the population in school; in Japan, 12 per cent.

South America is an uneducated continent. It is an unevangelized continent. It is a Scriptureless continent. The Bible is not given to the people. "It is safe to say that not one person out of 100,000 in South America would ever have seen a Bible but for the Protestant missionary movement."

"THE NEW YORK HERALD" AND THE ROMAN HIERARCHY

The unpatriotic attempts of the Roman hierarchy to muzzle the press and to nullify the Constitution guaranteeing its freedom by means of treason bills, presented by Roman Congressmen, is unblushingly undisguised.

It is openly alleged, upon good grounds, that the freedom of the press has long been suppressed by means of the subsidizing of the Roman hierarchy, which liberally wields the barbarous and brutal bludgeon of boycott.

Such, however, was not the case in the days of American independence and freedom.

James Gordon Bennett, the founder of "The New York Herald, was a Roman Catholic who feared not the Roman hierarchy. The following editorial from his pen appeared in "The New York Herald" in 1835:

"As a Catholic we call upon the Catholic bishop and clergy of New York to come forth from the darkness, folly and superstition of the tenth century. They live in the nineteenth. There can be no mistake about it—they will be convinced of this fact if they look in the almanac. . . .

"But though we want a thorough reform, we do not wish them to discard their greatest absurdities at the first breath. We know the difficulties of the task. Disciples, such as the Irish are, will stick with greater pertinacity to absurdities and nonsense than to reason and common sense. We have no objection to the doctrine of transubstantiation being tolerated for a few years to come. We may for a while indulge ourselves in the delicious luxury of creating and eating our Divinity. A peculiar taste of this kind, like smoking tobacco or drinking whiskey, cannot be given up all at once. The ancient Egyptians, for many years after they had lost every trace of the intellectual character of their religion, yet worshiped and adored the ox, the bull and the crocodile. They had not discovered the art, as we Catholics have done, of making a God out of bread, and of adoring and eating him one and the same moment. This latter piece of sublimity or religious cookery (we don't know which) was reserved for the educated and talented clergy from the tenth up to the nineteenth

century. Yet we do not advise the immediate disturbance of this venerable piece of rottenness and absurdity. It must be retained as we would retain carefully the tooth of a saint, or the jaw-bone of a martyr, till the natural progress of reason in the Irish mind shall be able, silently and imperceptibly, to drop it among the forgotten rubbish of his early loves, or his more youthful riots and rows.

"There must be a thorough reformation and revolution in the American Catholic Church. Education must be more attended to. We never knew one priest who believed that he ate the Divinity when he took the Eucharist. If we must have a pope, let us have a pope of our own—an American pope, an intellectual, intelligent and moral pope—not such a decrepit, licentious, stupid Italian blockhead as the College of Cardinals at Rome condescends to give the Christian world of Europe."

This editorial, if full of ginger, is full of truth. And it is equally apropos of Rome of to-day, if not more so; but where is the great newspaper which would dare to say it? America is no longer free, and its press is no longer free; for the tyrant hand of the Roman monster rules in all our great institutions.—Rev. W. Russell Collins, in "David's Sling."

"AS THY DAYS SO SHALL THY STRENGTH BE"

(Deut. 33: 25.)

"God hath not promised
Skies ever blue,
Flower-strewn pathways
Always for you.
God hath not promised
Sun without rain,
Joy without sorrow,
Peace without pain.
But He *hath* promised
Strength from above,
Unfailing sympathy,
Undying love."

OF DIVINE WISDOM

If any of you thinketh that he is wise among you . . . let him become a fool, that he may become wise.

The sermons of men of learning, who lack the Spirit, though they are made up of divers narratives, elegant descriptions, acute discourses, and exquisite proofs, yet are by no means the Word of God, but the words of men. . . .

Those that preach with zeal and sincerity preach for God; those that preach without them, preach for themselves.

Those that preach the Word of God with the Spirit make it take impression in the heart; but those that preach it without the Spirit carry it no further than to the ear.

Perfection doth not consist in teaching, but in doing; because he is neither the greatest saint nor the wisest man, that knows the truth most, but he that practises it.

It is a constant maxim that divine wisdom begets humility; and that which is acquired by the learned begets pride. . . .

The Spirit of Divine Wisdom fills men with sweetness, governs them with courage, and enlightens those with excellence who are subject to its direction.

Where the Divine Spirit dwells, there is always simplicity and holy liberty.—Molinos, 1675.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I give, devise and bequeath to Christ's Mission, New York, a corporation organized and existing under and pursuant to the Religious Corporations Law of the State of New York, and now located at No. 331 West 57th Street, in the city, county and State of New York

(Specify Here the Property)

to be applied to the uses and purposes of the said Mission, in such manner as the Board of Trustees thereof shall, in their discretion, determine.